



MEYERTONS
HOOD
KIVLIN
KOWERT
& GOETZEL

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS & UNFAIR COMPETITION

700 LAVACA, SUITE 800
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701
TELEPHONE (512) 853-8800
FACSIMILE (512) 853-8801

FAX

To: *Exr. Kamal Divecha*

From: *Stephen A. Mason*

Fax: *571-273-5863*

Pages: *5*

Phone: *571-272-5863*

Date: *12/29/2010*

Re: *09/6927765*

Phone: *512-853-8826*

THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL AND THE DOCUMENTS ACCOMPANYING THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT THIS COMMUNICATION MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT OR WORK-PRODUCT PRIVILEGE AND THAT THE DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT) TO ARRANGE FOR RETURN OF THE DOCUMENTS. RECEIPT BY ANYONE OTHER THAN THE INTENDED RECIPIENT IS NOT A WAIVER OF ANY ATTORNEY-CLIENT OR WORK-PRODUCT PRIVILEGE.

Doc Code: M865 or FAI.REQ.INTV

 PTOL-413A (10-09)
 Approved for use through 07/31/2012. OMB 0651-0031
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

 Application No.: 09/692,765 First Named Applicant: Sau/pawgh, Thomas E.
 Examiner: Kamal Divecha Art Unit: 2451 Status of Application: Final Rejection
Tentative Participants:

 (1) Exr. Kamal Divecha (2) _____

 (3) Robert C. Kowert (#39,255) (4) Stephen A. Mason (#64,303)

Proposed Date of Interview: _____ Proposed Time: _____ (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

 (1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

 Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>claims 1-48</u>	<u>Chu-Carroll</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

☒ Proposed Amendment or Arguments Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Please see attached statement & proposed amendment language.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Stephen A. Mason
 Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

64,303
 Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

14. (Proposed to be amended) A device, comprising:

a processor; and

a memory coupled to said processor, wherein said memory comprises program instructions executable by said processor to implement an event message gate unit configured to:

receive indications from one or more client processes registering interest in receiving one or more of a plurality of events generated by a service in a distributed computing environment;

automatically subscribe to the one or more events with the service in response to said indications registering interest in the one or more events received from the one or more client processes;

receive a message in a markup language sent to the device in the distributed computing environment from the service in the distributed computing environment, wherein the message includes a markup language representation of one of the one or more events generated by the service to which the event message gate unit is subscribed; and

send the markup language representation of the event to at least one of the one or more client processes registered with the event message gate unit to receive the event, wherein the markup language representation of the event represents the same event represented in said message.

Proposed amended independent claim 14 is allowable over Chu-Carroll.

1. **Chu-Carroll does not disclose an event message gate configured to perform both the receiving and sending limitations of claim 14 with respect to the same event, as recited.**

Applicants have proposed an amendment to claim 14 to clarify that “the markup language representation of the event represents the same event represented in said message.” Applicants have previously urged that Chu-Carroll does not disclose the recited “an event message gate unit configured to ... (1) receive a message in a markup language sent to the device in the distributed computing environment from the service in the distributed computing environment, wherein the message includes a markup language representation of one of the one or more events generated by the service to which the event message gate unit is subscribed; and (2) send the markup language representation of the event to at least one of the one or more client processes registered with the event message gate unit to receive the event.” The Final Office Action responds to this argument by citing ¶¶[0079]-[0083] of Chu-Carroll and arguing that “Chu-Carroll explicitly shows an example wherein the event system executing on the client side (1) receives the registrations from the server, (3) generates the events and (2) sends the events in markup language representation to the server.” Please note that Applicants have added the numerals (1) and (2) in both the claim quotation and the quotation of the Final Office Action, as well as the number (3) in the quotation of the Final Office Action, to clarify the points discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-proposed amendment would further clarify that a single event is handled in both (1) receiving and (2) sending steps of the recited claim. Chu-Carroll provides no such single event in the cited sections. Those sections of Chu-Carroll describing that “the event system executing on the client side (1) receives the registrations from the server” do not disclose the recited “(1) receive a message in a markup language sent to the device in the distributed computing environment from the service in the distributed computing environment, wherein the message includes a markup language representation of one of the one or more events

generated by the service to which the event message gate unit is subscribed” for a single event associated with the recited “send the markup language representation of the event to at least one of the one or more client processes registered with the event message gate unit to receive the event” and the above-proposed amendment is intended to make explicit the identity of the single event associated with both (1) the receiving and (2) the sending steps of the recited claim. Applicants submit that receiving a registration from the server does not disclose, either explicitly or under the principles of inherency, the recited “receive a message in a markup language” because the registration received from the server in ¶¶[0079]-[0083] of Chu-Carroll does not include “a markup language representation of one of the one or more events generated by the service,” as recited. Even if the registration is an event, the registration is not sent back from the recipient back to the registering party. Applicants further submit that the above-proposed amendment further clarifies that such a registration message does not satisfy the limitations recited in the proposed amended claim. The purpose of the amendment is to make clear that the single event associated with both (1) the receiving and (2) the sending steps is not the registration message of ¶¶[0079]-[0083] of Chu-Carroll.

As proposed to be amended, claim 14 is intended by Applicants to recite a message gate that is configured to send a markup language representation of the single event to at least one of the one or more client processes registered with the event message gate unit to receive the event. If the Examiner desires further clarifying change to the proposed amendment, Applicants desire to discuss such changes with the Examiner at the Examiner’s earliest convenience.